



City of Seattle  
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods  
Bernie Matsuno, Director

## **SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER  
SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER  
CHERRY HILL CAMPUS  
MAJOR INSTITUTIONS  
MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### **Committee Members**

Katie Porter, Chair

Leon Garnett

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Ralieg Watts

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Majo Hadlock

Linda Carrol

*Swedish Medical  
Center Non-  
management  
Representative*

Patrick Angus

David Letrondo

Lara Branigan

### **Committee Alternates**

James Schell

Dean Patton

Ashleigh Kilcup

### **Ex-officio Members**

Steve Sheppard

*Department of  
Neighborhoods*

Stephanie Haines

*Department of  
Planning and  
Development*

Andy Cosentino

*Swedish Medical  
Center Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh

*Seattle Department of  
Transportation*

### **DRAFT Meeting Notes**

#### **Meeting #18**

**August 14, 2014**

Swedish Medical Center

Swedish Cherry Hill Campus

550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

### **Members and Alternates Present**

Katie Porter	Dylan Glosecki	Dave Letrondo
Dean Patton	Laurel Spellman	Lara Branigan
Leon Garnett	James Schell	J Elliot Smith
Laurel Spelman	Linda Carol	Patrick Angus
Ralieg Watts		

### **Members and Alternates Absent**

Maja Hadlock      Ashleigh Kilcup

### **Ex-Officio Members Present**

Steve Sheppard, DON

Stephanie Haines, DPD

Andy Cosentino, SMC

Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT

*(See sign-in sheet)*

### **I. Welcome and Introductions**

Ms. Katie Porter opened the meeting and briefly went over the agenda for the meeting. A motion was presented to approve tonight's agenda and the motion was approved.

Ms. Porter introduced Mr. Andy Cosentino to lead off the SMC presentations.

### **II. SMC Presentation Regarding the Design Guidelines**

Editor's note: Much of this presentation and discussion related to review of the new 3-D model and was not easily summarized in written form.

Mr. Cosentino stated that much of the presentation would relate to a new 3-D Model developed by Callison Architects. The model starts with Alternative 10. He noted that it also includes plug and play modules

that will allow the Committee to look at various alternative heights for development in key areas, and particularly what the lower heights would look like for the west tower in the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue half block and the block between 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Avenues. He also noted that SMC will present information on possible design guidelines, neighborhood amenities as well as an update on the work in progress by the Integration Transportation Board.

### **Incorporation of Design Guidelines in the Plan**

Mr. John Jex was introduced to present the model. Mr. John Jex stated that SMC had developed its new 3-d model to respond to the CAC comment letter and demonstrate what alternative heights might look like. He noted that the institution would like to get feedback from the Committee after the presentation and passed out feedback forms for members to use as they go over the presentation.

Mr. Jex stated that SMC is now committed to incorporating design guidelines into the final master plan and are now working on those guidelines. They will be an appendix to the Master Plan. The design guidelines will help define the scale and create a more pedestrian feel. They would address elements such as landscaping, façade treatments, and the treatment of vertical setbacks.

### **Discussion of Open Spaces and Other Amenities**

Mr. Jex noted that there had been several conversations concerning what is usable open space. After a review of the open spaces, the design of the central plaza area has been amended to no longer include the driveway and parking. The area will be changed to create a new edge for tables and chairs that will be more open to the public. He briefly outlined other open spaces including a proposed 25 ft. setbacks the rear lot lines of properties facing 18<sup>th</sup>. He noted that all parking in the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue half block has been moved underground and that no portion will not extend above grade on the read (east) lot one.

Mr. Jex briefly outlined amenities that would added to the plan in response to the CAC's comments. These include:1) a Health Walk along the edges of the MIO tht would be intended to promote a more active lifestyle with exercise stations that reinforces and provide information about the health walk program as part of an informational message; 2) creation of view nodes and a more open public lobby, 3) a public terrace and a pathway to the east node;4) a daycare center that will be used 50/50 by the neighbors and employees at the plaza park in the north side of the annex building will also be included; and 5) a Wellness Center that would tie into various Swedish Health Education programs as well as to the Seattle University athletic gym.

### **Illustration of Various Height Alternatives**

Discussion then turned to height, bulk and scale. Various heights were demonstrated by removing stories from the alternative 10 starting point to illustrate changes along both the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Half Block and the 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue Block.

Editor's note: At this time, the CAC members had the opportunity to walk around the room to view the model and various accompanying illustrations.
--

There was considerable back and forth conversation between members and staff during this “walk around” which could not be summarized in these notes.

### **Transportation Master Plan**

Mr. Cosentino stated that the chairman of the Integration Transportation Board (ITB) was present and would provide an update on the work of the board. The ITB is looking at van pool opportunities, security and parking, Metro Transit systems, bikes, street car and a program called “Live Where You Work”. He briefly discussed the Live where You Work program. Much of the congestion related to SMC development is related to the fact that most of SMC’s employees do not live close to Cherry Hill. He noted the between the various employers on the Campus 117 employees live within a one mile radius. The vast majority of these people walk to work. He noted that the TMP goal is 50% and currently Swedish is at 59% which is not acceptable. To get to that 50% SMC will have to reduce trips by 109 trips. SMC would like to establish incentives that would encourage employees to surrender their vehicles, and/or relocate to the neighborhood.

Mr. Cosentino introduced Naren Balasubramaniam, the chair of the ITB. Mr. Balasubramaniam stated SMC wants to be a good neighbor. He noted that he had walked down the street along the campus, block by block and witnessed the challenging situation in the neighborhood. In order to resolve these challenges a unified approach including participation by all the major stakeholders around the neighborhood is needed.

The ITB has met three times, received presentations from other companies, and looked at capacity and parking utilization. It is the job of the board to create a cultural shift that will focus not only on traffic and parking but as well as the wellness and well-being of the surrounding neighborhood. He briefly discussed various possible future actions and noted that this effort is of great importance to the senior management of SMC.

Ms. Porter noted tht SMC has referenced the need to take 109 cars off the road in order to meet the TMP 50% goal. With all of the new development proposed it would seem that a great many more cars would have to be removed. Mr. Balasubramaniam responded that the 109 care reduction relates to current actions with the current development. Mr. Porter whether the incentives and penalties would apply to venders and others making deliveries. Mr. Balasubramaniam responded SMC has a great deal of influence with both tenants and venders and will explore multiple options and to leverage and influence their behaviors as well as looking at how other hospitals have handled this.

Ms. Porter noted that the DEIS concludes that there would be significant unmitigated traffic impact on the neighborhood. The reality seem to be that there may be unmitigated traffic impacts on the neighborhood. Mr. Cosentino responded by stating that it is difficult to forecast what the impact in the future will be regarding these traffic congestions.

### **IV. General Committee Discussion**

Discussion then turned to general member comments. Ms. Porter noted that SMC appeared to have responded too many of the requests of the Committee. She noted that not everyone would likely see this new alternative that way, but others may.

Mr. Consentino stated that SMC had tried to reduce elevations substantially. The west tower on the 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue block has been reduced about 35% in height. In order to do this

and still meet SMC needs a great deal of creativity was needed. One major way this was done was to cantilever development on the 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue Block over the parking garage. Mr. Sheppard noted that on the model and in the DEIS many existing buildings are shown unchanged. He asked if this is the case. Mr. Cosentino responded that in most, but not all cases this is the case. The west tower and MOB would be removed and replaced.

Ms. Porter asked for more clarity on the design guidelines. Mr. Jex responded that it was the intent of SMC to take the City of Seattle December 2013 design document use that as a starting point and add information more directly related to this major institution. That document would then be appended to the Major Institutions Master Plan.

Members noted that there was discussion of incorporating a hotel into the hospital. Mr. Cosentino responded that SMC anticipates by 2040 there will be about 84 rooms. There are currently 24. These are currently in the West Tower. These rooms will be restricted to only patients and families and not for the public.

A comment was made regarding 17<sup>th</sup> avenue connectivity and access after regular hours. Mr. Jex responded that the team is currently in discussion regarding campus security, and the design features will allow easy access to 18<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Porter asked that the CAC have the opportunity to review the design guidelines as part of the approval process.

Lara Branigan stated that SU is a neighbor along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and that there is an open space node on the corner of the parking lot and the setbacks in their plan. She stated that the focus on setbacks and other design elements in this are good. She encouraged SMC to coordinate its development with SU. She noted that 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue is presently a "dead zone" but development by both SU and SMC would provide an opportunity to significantly improve this street. She noted that the SU MIMP allows development up to 65 feet on the east side of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She noted that it is important to keep this in mind long-term.

Ms. Porter stated that it is admirable that SMC would have a retail tenant as Wellness Center, but it feels like that a gym is not a community amenity. Mr. Cosentino stated that the concept goes well beyond a fitness center, prevention, wellness, nutritional counseling.

Patrick Angus stated that he too saw 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue as a particularly unappealing street. The addition of the wellness center near the SU athletic facilities might be a major improvement. He suggested that there be program integration between both SU and SMC and mentioned the SU nursing program as offering a starting point.

Dean Paton stated that it was his observation that the CAC has lost its focus on the big picture and is focusing on detail. These details are essentially distractions. For the last several months, over 100 members of the neighborhood have expressed the consensus position that the development is simply too high, bulky and brings too many new people into this low-rise neighborhood. It appears that the only people who disagree are representatives Swedish, Sabey or Providence. He noted that this would be more appropriate downtown and not here. The 250,000 square foot reduction in total proposed development is insignificant. He asked why SMC and Sabey have concluded that its needs and desires should take priority over the need of a residential neighborhood that has been here over 100 years old and potentially destroy the neighborhood.

Mr. Glosecki stated that the Committee continues to talk about bulk, height and scale and noted that the Committee cannot spend the entire conversation around those elements, and that there are multiple things and issues that will impact the neighborhood which are not only height, bulk and scale. He noted that he still has many issues with the heights and scales. He asked if the development on the 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue block could be further split to have greater height modulation. Mr. Jex responded that there were significant issues with floor plates. The desire is to have clinical research in that building and that drives floor plate design.

Ms. Porter stated that she too still has questions concerning, bulk, height, and scale but is trying to balance this against her realization that the area is growing and that some increased in the scale of development here are probably inevitable. She stated tht she is not against growth, but would hate to see Seattle turn into San Francisco. Swedish and Sabey now appear to be trying to accommodate the Committee's comments. There will be various accommodations from both sides. No one will be entirely happy with the outcome. She noted that differences between the initial proposals with boundary expansions, street vacations and greater height and the present proposals. They are not perfect but appear to be improvements

Mr. Cosentino stated that Swedish made attempts to addressing the various concerns of the CAC and DPD. This is not a quick process and is challenging and costly.

Dean Paton noted the medical institution and the research center are out of scale and the Sabey properties. He reiterated that by agreeing to small changes the CAC is not adequately addressing the height issues. He noted that he was an Urban Planning major in college and that this proposal would not meet normal standards. Ms. Porter asked if Mr. Patton saw the current proposal as an improvement in any way. He agreed that it is smaller than what was first proposed, but it is still far too large and needs to be reduced further.

Dylan Glosecki stated that he continues to believe tht additional development should be planned on the Kidney Center site. He also stated that the development in the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue half block should be stepped down so that no portion would be above 37 feet.

#### **IV. Public Comments**

The meeting was then opened for public comments. Ms. Porter requested that commenters focus on the MIMP and not Swedish as an employer or the quality of care that commenters may or may not have received.

**Comments from Claudia Montmayer** Ms. Montmayer stated that she appreciates the work that is being done, but in her opinion, she would like to discuss the big picture which is the height, bulk, and scale. The height bulk and scale is not compatible with the neighborhood. She also noted that the minor reductions in total proposed development is not significant, they are nearly the same as what was first proposed. She also stated that it would appear that any discussion of design guidelines should follow agreement on the overall height bulk and sale of development.

**Comment from Bob Cooper:** Mr. Cooper stated that it was very telling that Mr. Cosentino stated that SMC was working to addressed the concerns presented by the CAC and DPD, but said nothing about SMC efforts to address the concerns that SMC hears from its neighbors, this audience and the people who live here. There is a consensus among a great many of

the neighbors that current proposal is fundamentally incompatible with this neighborhood. Even with the smaller size being presented the changes are not significantly smaller. That consensus is that: 1) a 105 foot maximum height is appropriate, 2) further height reductions below that level should occur along the edges of the campus; 3) that the buildings along 18<sup>th</sup> are still too big; and 4) that the expansions in heights etc. should only be for the hospital and not Sabey. SMC should make some priority decisions. Not every use that SMC has envisioned for this campus can be accommodated and still strike a balance. He noted that his home, and many others, predate the hospital. The hospital was not here first.

**Comment from Ellen Sollod:** Ms. Sollod stated that she appreciates Swedish preparing a model. She noted that the proposal is essentially rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. It does is reduced one square foot from the 2.75 million square feet included in Alternative 10. It does nothing to provide the transition to the neighborhood. Heights may be more compatible with the interior of the campus but not with the surrounding neighborhood. The 160 ft. buildings will still cast shadows as far north as Marion Street, and the mechanical housing that will be on top of the building is too much. There is still too much height, bulk scale density and intensity being proposed. She noted how she appreciates Swedish needs to expand, but does appreciate Swedish desires to expand in this location. She challenged Swedish to look at expansion elsewhere. She noted that she agrees with Ms. Porter that increased density is unavoidable. But this is for people and housing and not part of the medical/industrial complex. The neighborhood has agreed to greater density. There are more people and housing unit is in the neighborhood. She asked what it would take to have SMC senior staff to move into the neighborhood.

**Comment from Claire Lane:** Ms. Lane stated that she lives on 16<sup>th</sup> and Marion. She appreciates there are the concerns regarding height, bulk, scale and setbacks. She stated that is was her opinion that SMC has made few real tradeoffs. She noted her major concerns with traffic, parking and transportation. She stated that there seem to be comprehensive policies suggested to apply to all tenants, but remains skeptical that this will occur. Housing is a huge problem in the neighborhood and there needs to be a plan for housing development for SMC staff. She would like to see more transit planning and the 50% SOV goal is not sufficient to the neighborhood and have the issue of bulk, density, and transit as part of the compromise process. There needs to be more compromise

**Comments from Abel Bradshaw:** Ms. Bradshaw stated that lives on 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue and she stated that proposal is not something new, and it is the same square footage. She stated that in her opinion the MIMP should be rejected. She mentioned how the issue of height, bulk and scale are keep coming up because Swedish refuses to negotiate. She agreed that the pollinator pathway is a wonderful idea. However as her house borders that feature she has questions. At the present time she cannot grow much in the shade along this area from the existing buildings. He also noted that this would result in many people walking right behind her home. She stated that she does not look forward to people walking along the pathway in my backyard. She also stated that the building is going to block out my view of the sky and there has been no mitigation regarding that.

SMC has resisted neighbor's suggestions and public comment now for two years and refused to really negotiate height bulk and scale. It is getting very frustrating.

**Comments from Catie Chaplain:** Ms. Chaplain lives on 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She stated that she agree with the comments made by Mr. Cooper and Ms. Bradshaw. She noted about the proposal regarding transportation and public amenities. It is ironic that this proposal that appears so out of scale to the neighborhood offers no substantial solution for traffic. There will be more congestion and there should be bigger setbacks discussed in the planning. She stated that the Health Walk proposal could have been a sidewalk, and that day care is a great idea but it is not a true public amenity, and it has nothing to do with the neighborhood. The discussion of encouraging employees to live in the neighborhoods is good, but the discussion tht SMC has identified its overall need for SOV use reduction at a mere 109 cars is depressing.

**Comment from Chris Genese:** Mr. Genese stated that he is from the Washington Community Action Network and that he supported the set of principles and demands that Mr. Cooper provided. Community testimony has been that 105 ft. maximum height is not really close to that. The Wellness and health center are not community benefits and will not compensate the way the neighborhood. Real compensations would be access to affordable health care. SMC should be willing to compromise to 105 feet.

**Comment from Cindy Thelen:** Ms. Thelen stated that she lives on 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She thanked Dean Patton for listening to neighbors. She stated that the issue of loading and unloading should be addressed and the noise pollution being created by truck deliveries should be limited in a certain timeframe. She noted that if Swedish and Sabey would like to assert themselves as being a good neighbor, they should address the loading dock noise issue. Tonight's proposal still places a 50 foot building directly behind her home. Neighbors have repeatedly rejected the health walk as an amenity. She urged the total rejection of the present proposal.

**Comment from Julie Popper:** Ms. Popper represents the SEIU Healthcare 1199 Northwest. She stated that the document handed out by Mr. Copper is the right approach. She noted that having daycare and a gym sounds great, but how about providing affordable health benefits to their employees. With regards to transit, she mentioned that Swedish only pays one method of transportation and the rest is supported by tax dollars. She also noted that if Swedish want their employees live closer to their work, they should pay them decently so they can afford living in the neighborhood.

**Comment from Vicki Schiantarelli:** Ms. Schiantarelli lives on 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue and stated the proposals do not reflect the scale near her property correctly and provided example from the model. She stated that she was a vice chair of the committee in 1994 and considerations then was what were amenities versus mitigations that were presented were not met. She mentioned that the primary role of the advisory committee is to work with the major institution and the City to produce a Master plan that meets the intent of the Code. . The Committee comments should focus on identifying and mitigating potential impacts on the surrounding community. She noted that the code states that The Committee may comment on a wide variety of issues including need, but that these elements are not subject to negotiation nor can they be sued to delay final consideration of the plan. Amenities are OK but mitigations are more important. There is insufficient mitigation contained in this proposal.

**Comment from Jerry Matsui:** Mr. Matsui stated that putting a lipstick and a mascara on a pig will still remain a pig. He noted that the problem was the aerial views that were presented are intended to make the building look smaller. They are not and are still gigantic. He noted that presentation are not talking about mitigations and the issues are still bulk, height, and scale, intensity of traffic and pollution and creating this massive mausoleum. Swedish have not met the 50% goal in 20 years and mitigating the traffic of their employees. Swedish have not accomplished anything in the past three meetings.

**Comment from Melissa Flynn:** Ms. Flynn stated that she lives behind Providence. Recently encountered an individual pacing back and forth. She asked the individual if she could assist him he declined stating that he was just waiting for his appointment at SMC. He received heart treatment there for years and mentioned that he routinely found free parking for his hour appointment in the Neighborhood. She mentioned that there was a garage closer. He told her that he did not want to pay any parking fee so as he has no problem parking along the neighborhood, he does so.

**Comment from Christian Oliver Grant:** Mr. Grant lives on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue east of Columbia Street and he agrees with the comments made by Dean Paton. Mr. Grant stated that he would like to see some guidelines concerning heights that were found to be acceptable at other similarly placed institutions to serve as a yardstick. He also stated about what is the feasibility of having Swedish and Sabey acquiring more properties and what options has been explored. He stated that he loves Seattle University and if there is an opportunity for Swedish and Seattle University to collaborate regarding health and wellness education amenities along 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>, he would be encouraged.

**Comments from Janet Van Fleet:** Ms. Van Fleet lives on 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She stated her concerns about density and traffic. She mentioned that an increase in density will spread all over the place and having a huge institution on the scale of Swedish and Sabey will bring in tremendous amount of traffic that is already been happening along Jefferson and James St. She also said about with this tremendous traffic as well as a population explosion creates terrible air quality. She referenced the cumulative impact of other developments such as Yesler Terrace.

**Comment from Sonya Richter:** Ms. Richter stated that she lives on 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and that the site is simply too small to accommodate the proposed plans. The expansion is too big, tall and bulky on the Jefferson side and little attention has been paid to either the Jefferson or Cherry facades. The north facade needs a great deal more attention. She stated that the central plaza and drive is not good open space.

## **VI. Continued Committee Discussion**

Ms. Porter concluded the public comment period and asked members if they would like to provide their comments.

Mr. Glosecki stated that the collaboration between Swedish and Seattle University is a good start and working together to share future development plans are realistic. He urged continued collaboration.

Ms. Porter stated that she was surprised that the Committee is still hearing so much push back from neighbors concerning this proposal. Neighbors still object to the height, bulk and scale in this new direction. This is meaningful. Earlier in the meeting she expected some



greater level of comfort with the reductions in heights proposed by SMC. She understood that efforts are being made on the transportation issues. Her concerns, however, was that she has not heard sufficient details not acceptance from neighbors. SMC has tried to respond to the previous Committee comments and the discussion may be headed on the right direction though and that is encouraging.

Dean Patton noted his previous question as to why SMC believed that they should get virtually everything they want but in the process destroy the neighborhood. He noted that is the consistent view of the neighborhood is feeling right now. Mr. Cosentino responded that the mission of Swedish is a healing ministry and they do not want to destroy anyone or anything. What SMC hopes to do is to build something unique that benefits the community and its neighbors. He believes that the CAC will find a balance approach that will accommodate the neighborhood and Swedish and noted that he rejected the notion that the mission of Swedish is to destroy the neighborhood.

Raleigh Watts stated that he lives a bit farther away for the institution. The neighbors from the broader Central Area appear to see the process as moving in the right direction with regards to height, bulk, scale and amenities. He stated his appreciation of the public comments regarding the transportation issues. He noted that he is interested to see how Swedish could demonstrate its rapid reaction of bringing down the 58% rating to 50% and how to measure it. He mentioned that he is looking forward of dealing with the transportation issues with an innovative approach rather than a traditional one.

There was brief discussion about moving the future meeting to later in September. No date was set at the meeting.

#### **VII. Adjournment**

No further business being before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.